



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/478,112	01/04/2000	REED PADI MAW STURTEVANT	11040/002001	1247

24251 7590 04/25/2002

SKJERVEN MORRILL MACPHERSON LLP
25 METRO DRIVE
SUITE 700
SAN JOSE, CA 95110

EXAMINER

WANG, MARY DA ZHI

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3621

DATE MAILED: 04/25/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/478,112

Applicant(s)

STURTEVANT ET AL.

Examiner

Mary Wang

Art Unit

2161

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 January 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2161

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 19 is objected to because of the following informalities: one of the words "company" needs to be deleted at line 2 of the claim. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 12, recites "the permissions comprise --" at line 2 of the claim. It is not clear "the permissions" refers to "an access permission" which associated with at least one of the users, or "a grant permission" which is granted by at least of one the users, or "a permission" which is granted by the user to another user as claimed in claim 1.

As to claims 13-14, it is not clear what "aggregate of other permission" or "aggregate permission" mean.

As to claim 15, it is not clear what "the other user's permission" refers to.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application

by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

5. Claims 1-5, 10-11, 16-18 and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lewis, U. S. Patent 6,233,576.

As to claim 1, Lewis teaches a method comprising:

- a) Making at least one digital facility available from a source to users via an electronic communication medium (Figs. 1-2),
- b) Associating with at least one of users an access permission that enables the user to access at least one of the digital facilities (column 10 lines 37-39, 55 – column 11 line 20 and column 12 lines 5-10, 64 – column 13 line 15 and column 14 lines 38-45 and column 15 lines 36-67 and Fig. 2),
- c) Associating with at least one of the users a grant permission that enables the user to give to another user a permission with respect at least one of the digital facilities (column 10 lines 37-39, 55 – column 11 line 20 and column 12 lines 5-10, 64 – column 13 line 15 and column 14 lines 38-45 and column 15 lines 36-67 and Fig. 2).

As to claim 2, Lewis teaches the permission that is granted to another user comprises a perform permission (column 7 lines 36-67).

As to claim 3, Lewis teaches the permission that is granted to another user comprises a grant permission (column 10 lines 37-39, 55 – column 11 line 20 and column 12 lines 5-10, 64 – column 13 line 15 and column 14 lines 38-45 and column 15 lines 36-67 and Fig. 2).

As to claim 4, Lewis teaches the digital facility comprises data (Figs. 1-2).

As to claim 5, Lewis teaches the digital facility comprises a service (Figs. 1-2).

As to claim 10, Lewis teaches the user can give the other user both access permission and grant permission (column 7 lines 36-67 and column 10 lines 37-39, 55 – column 11 line 20 and column 12 lines 5-10, 64 – column 13 line 15 and column 14 lines 38-45 and column 15 lines 36-67 and Fig. 2).

As to claim 11, Lewis teaches the digital facility comprises an application program, and the application defines the permissions (column 12 line 64 – column 13 line 15).

Claims 16-18 and 21 are rejected for the similar reason as claim 1.

As to claim 22, Lewis teaches the permission information is stored as user profiles in the database (Fig. 2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2161

7. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. Claims 12, 25 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis, U. S. Patent 6,233,576.

As to claim 12, Lewis teaches granting permission to users as discussed above. Lewis does not specifically teach the users comprises individuals who are associated with respective companies, and the permissions comprises company permissions that apply to individuals associated with one of the companies and individual permissions that apply individual to a user. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to allow the system of Lewis to be used for company granting permissions for users so that this secured system would be expanded its usage environment.

Claim 25 is rejected for the similar reason as claim 12.

As to claim 27, Lewis teaches a method comprising:

a) Making at least one digital facility available from a source to user via an electronic communication medium (Figs. 1-2);

Art Unit: 2161

b) Maintaining a database of profiles that define permissions of users to access the digital facility (column 10 lines 37-39, 55 – column 11 line 20 and column 12 lines 5-10, 64 – column 13 line 15 and column 14 lines 38-45 and column 15 lines 36-67 and Fig. 2);

c) Authorizing at least one user to create profile for other users (column 10 lines 37-39, 55 – column 11 line 20 and column 12 lines 5-10, 64 – column 13 line 15 and column 14 lines 38-45 and column 15 lines 36-67 and Fig. 2)

d) Automatically marking a user who creates a profile for another user (column 5 lines 33-45 and column 10 lines 37-39, 55 – column 11 line 20 and column 12 lines 5-10, 64 – column 13 line 15 and column 14 lines 38-45 and column 15 lines 36-67 and Fig. 2).

Lewis does not specifically state that this method can be used for managing company profiles. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to allow the system of Lewis to be used for managing company profiles so that this secured system would be expanded its usage environment.

9. Claims 6-9, 19-20 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis, U. S. Patent 6,233,576 in view of Schneider et al., U. S. Patent 6,178,505.

As to claims 6-7 and 9, Lewis teaches granting permission to users as discussed above. Lewis does not specifically state that the source comprises a web server, the users comprises individuals using web browsers, and the electronic communication medium comprises the Internet. However, these well known features are specifically

Art Unit: 2161

taught by Schneider (column 4 lines 58-67 and Fig. 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the web server, web browsers and Internet as taught by Schneider in the system of Lewis for faster communication among the users.

As to claim 8, Lewis does not specifically teach the users are employees of companies. However, Schneider teaches this matter (column 4 lines 58-62). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to allow the method of Lewis to be used for employees of companies as taught by Schneider so that this secured system would be expanded its usage environment.

Claims 19-20 and 23 are rejected for the similar reasons as claims 1 and 6-9.

10. Claims 13-15, 24 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis, U. S. Patent 6,233,576 in view of Abadi et al., U. S. Patent 5,173,939.

As to claims 13-14 and 26, Lewis teaches granting permission to users as discussed above. Lewis does not specifically teach at least one of the permission comprises an aggregate of other permissions, the aggregate permission includes fundamental permissions that have arguments of a common type. Abadi teaches this matter (Figs. 2-5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the aggregate permission and the fundamental permission in the system of Lewis for better granting permissions.

As to claim 15, the method of Lewis modified by Abadi does not specifically teach the other's user's permission with respect to the digital facility is determined by a

Art Unit: 2161

combination of individual permissions and company permission. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the feature of obtaining a permission by combining two different permissions or authentications in the method of Lewis modified by Abadi for better granting permissions to users.

As to claim 24, Lewis does not specifically teach the permissions comprise cascading permissions. However, Abadi teaches this matter (column 6 line 50 – column 7 line 35). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the cascading permissions in the system of Lewis for better granting permissions.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Janis (Eurorpean Patent 0 447 339 A2) discloses providing variable authority level user access control for a plurality of resource objects within a distributed data processing system having a plurality of resource managers.

Hardy et al. (U. S. Patent 6,073,242) discloses an electronic communication authority server that provides centralized key management, implementation of role-based enterprise policies and workflow and projection of corporate authorities over trusted networks.

Anand et al. (U. S. Patent 6,044,466) discloses a dynamic derivation mechanism is defined which enables limited permissions to be dynamically and flexibly derived for executables based upon their authenticated description.

Art Unit: 2161

Bapat et al. (U. S. Patent) discloses an access control objects that collectively store information that specifies access rights by users to specified sets of the managed objects.

Inquire

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mary Wang whose telephone number is (703)-305-0084. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Thursday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trammell, can be reached on (703) 305-9768.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceedings is assigned are as follows:

(703) 746-7238 (After Final Communication)
(703) 746-7239 (Official Communications)
(703) 746-7240 (For Status inquiries, draft communication)

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-3900.


JAMES P. TRAMMELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Mary Wang
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2161
April 18, 2002